

## REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed April 17, 2007. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-20 were pending in this Application. Claims 1-20 were rejected and Claims 1, 15, and 16 were objected to. Claims 1 and 6-9 have been amended to further define various features of Applicants' invention. Claims 2-3 and 11-20 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. New Claims 21-32 have been added. Thus, Claims 1, 4-10, and 21-32 are currently pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 1, 15 and 16 were objected due to the recitation of certain phrases, which the Examiner recommended be replaced with alternative language. Applicants have amended Claim 1 to delete the number "52," which was included due to a clerical error. Claims 15 and 16 have been cancelled. Therefore, Applicants request withdrawal of the objections to the claims.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 1-5, 11, 14 and 17-20 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants submit that amendments to Claim 1 render this rejection moot. Further, Claims 11, 14, and 17-20 have been cancelled. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3, 11-13, 15-17 and 20 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0078597 by Ray Sun et al. ("Sun").

Applicants respectfully submit that *Sun* does not show all of the elements of Applicant's claims as amended, and therefore, *Sun* cannot anticipate the amended claims.

For example, amended Claim 1 recites:

1. A method for activating a wireless network security with a wireless host, comprising:
  - in a wireless network having a deactivated wireless network security, a wireless host establishing a communication connection with a client;
  - in response to the communication connection, the wireless host automatically requesting from the client a determination of whether to activate the wireless network security;
  - the wireless host receiving from the client a determination to activate the wireless network security;
  - in association with the determination to activate the wireless security network, the wireless host receiving an identifier code from the client;
  - the wireless host determining that the received identifier code matches a unique key-code maintained by the wireless host; and
  - as a result of determining that the received identifier code matches the unique key-code maintained by the wireless host, the wireless host activating the deactivated wireless security network to secure the wireless host.

Thus, Claim 1 recites a method for activating a deactivated wireless network security for a wireless network. More particularly, a wireless host activates the deactivated wireless network security after receiving a determination from a wireless client to activate the wireless network security, as well as an identifier code from the wireless client that matches a unique key-code maintained by the wireless host.

*Sun* teaches nothing similar to this process. The portion of *Sun* cited by the Examiner with respect to Claim 1 -- namely, Figure 4 and associated text, Paragraph [0044] (see Office Action, pages 3-4) -- clearly does not teach this process. Rather, Paragraph [0044] of *Sun* merely discloses a process for logging into a network:

**[0044] FIG. 4 illustrates a process for logging into a network** with PEAP, in accordance with aspects of the invention. After starting, the process flows to block 405, where a new wireless network is detected. Moving to block 410, the user clicks connect to begin connecting to the network. Flowing to decision block 415, a determination is made as to whether the login information for the domain has been saved. When the information has not been saved, the process flows to block 420 where the user is prompted for the information required to logon to the network.

According to one embodiment, this information includes a username, password, and domain. When the information has been saved, the process flows to block 425 where the username and domain are sent to the AP. The process then moves to decision block 430 where a determination is made as to whether the username/domain is accepted. When the username/domain is not accepted, the process flows to block 435 to re-request the information. When the information is accepted, the process flows to block 440 where the information is sent for PEAP authorization. Transitioning to decision block 445 a determination is made as to whether the credentials are accepted. When they are not accepted the process flows to block 450 where an error message is sent. When the credentials are accepted, the login is successful (block 455), and the process returns to processing other actions. (emphasis added).

Thus, Paragraph [0044] discusses a process for a user to log in to a network according to a PEAP authentication protocol. This process is fundamentally different from activating a deactivated wireless network security for a wireless network, as recited in Applicants' amended Claim 1. There is nothing in Paragraph [0044], nor the remainder of *Sun*, that discloses activating a deactivated wireless network security for a wireless network.

For at least these reasons, *Sun* clearly does not teach or suggest all elements of amended Claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of amended Claim 1, as well as Claims 4-10 and 21-24 that depend from Claim 1.

In addition, for analogous reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of new independent Claims 25 and 30, as well as Claims 26-29 and 31-32 that depend therefrom.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 4, 5 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sun* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,120,129 issued to Arun Ayyagari et al. ("Ayyagari"). In addition, Claims 6-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sun* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,993,552 issued to Andrew W. Jacobs et al. ("Jacobs").

Applicants submit that these rejections are now moot in light of the amendments made to Claim 1 and the preceding discussion.

Applicants further submit that the rejections of Claims 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are also moot, as Claims 18 and 19 have been cancelled.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the amendments and remarks set forth above. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims.

Applicants believe there are no fees due at this time. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2148 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicants' attorney at 512.322.2689.

Respectfully submitted,  
BAKER BOTT S L.L.P.  
Attorney for Applicants

*E. M. Grabski.*

Eric M. Grabski  
Reg. No. 51,749

Date: July 17, 2007

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

BAKER BOTT S L.L.P.

CUSTOMER NO. **23640**

512.322.2689

512.322.8383 (fax)